

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.unpto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/748,686	12/31/2003	George Fitzmaurice	1500.1087	1971	
21171 7590 11/03/2009 STAAS & HALSEY LLP			EXAMINER		
SUITE 700			SHERMAN, STEPHEN G		
1201 NEW YO WASHINGTO	ORK AVENUE, N.W. ON DC 20005		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
······································	71, 50 2000		2629		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/03/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/748,686	FITZMAURICE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	STEPHEN G. SHERMAN	2629	

	STEPHEN G. SHERMAN	2629						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 26 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	THE REPLY FILED 26 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 3 To FA. 13.1; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing by Depriod for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire by Carlot on the Carlot of t	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL								
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on, A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extreasion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to any other dismissed of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
AMENDMENTS  3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);								
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</li> </ul>								
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendmen	nt canceling the					
7. Sor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 26. Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-21.23.25 and 27-33.		I be entered and an e	xplanation of					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affidavi	it or other evidence is	necessary and					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.  10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail se 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:								
See Continuation Sheet.  12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).								
13. Other								
/Amr Awad/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629								

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: On pages 11-17 of the response the Applicant argues the rejections, specifically the Durran and Iveran references. First, the Applicant argues that Durran does not disclose "the arc is substantially perpendicular to a natural motion path of the natural motion" however, just because Durrani does not use these exact words does not made not disclose the feature. The Figures clearly show the interface the same as the Applicant's, therefore if the Applicant thinks that Durrani doesn't teach the feature, the Applicant desent either and is admiting 112, first paragraph problems with their claims. Secondly, the Applicant argues that Iversa does not disclose that the ment is located in the lower corner of the display but rather next to the current, however, lewman was not used to teach the corner feature but rather Durrani was used to teach the interface in the lower corner. Iweman was only used for the teaching that an interface can be presented on different sides to appease right and left handed users and when this teaching is applied to Durrani it would be clear that the interface could be located in the lower left or lower right corner in order to achieve the handedness advantages to doing this taught by Iversa. Thus there is no hindisgith used since one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have readily realized the advantages of the teachings as applied. Further, as shown in the Figures of Durrani the menu is located in corner, but the menu rotates such that all of the letters can be accessed, as such the menu part that is 'hidden' is an underlying menu that is activated up no rotating the control wheel, where since the menu is drief when a "radius" is responsive to the underlying menu. This is clearly depicted by the Figures. If the Applicant wishes for the claim limitation to mean something more specific then the claims should be amended to more clearly and accurately claim the invention to mean